85-1270

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 8 1986
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

NO._____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1985

JULIE KIENAST

Petitioner

vs

STATE OF CALIFORNIA ET AL.

Respondents

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT

JULIE KIENAST
PRO PER

3610 West Sixth St. no. 622
Los Angles, Ca 90020

(213) 661-9089

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

The right of all citizens to sue in a United States court of law and the right to amend a complaint before it can be dismissed by a Magistrate. Also the right to equal protection of the law under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, and also includes provisions of the fourth and Sixth Amendments of the United States Constitution.

Also the right of all Citizens to proper legal representation without fraud, and any groups political or religious reasons used in a law firm to obstruct justice and use clients for their personal politics or affiliations to a foreign Nation or religion, or working in a conspirecy to cover up for each others using the law and endangering the rights

Questions Presented

and lives of any American Citizen. And the obligation of any State Bar to disiplin unethical Attorneys without regard to their political or religious beliefs or what church they attend or race or National origion.

Federal funds canno't be distributed to any agency for the purpose of inforcing Civil Rights unless they fairely without any kind of prejudice inforce the Civil Rights of all American Citizens without any regard to the race, religion, or National Origion of the ones whos rights are violated or the ones doing the violations.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

All police Departments must be obligated to fairely inforce the laws regardless of politics, wealth or social status of the people involved. The obligation of any police officer not to make and arrest that he knows to be and unfounded one regardless of the wealth of the individuels or a Chief of a department personal friendship with the people. As in Plaintiffs case the arresting officer stating, "if you have enough money you can do anythang."

No one religious or ethnic group of people can be allowed to actually control the law, media, movie and publishing industrys for the rights and safety of all Americans and our leaders and political system. And it was so stated to Plaintiff that we controll the law and the media.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CITATIONS	ii
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATMENTS OF THE CASE	4
REASONS WHY THE WRIT SHOULD BE GRANTED	
APPENDEX	

TABLE OF CITATIONS

FEDERAL CIVIL PROCEDURE '1824 FED rules Civil proc. rule-4-A 28USCA 1742.

USCA Const. Amends,1 14 Baird Vs, State Bar of Arizona 91 S ct. 702, 401 U.S. 1-27 L ED.2 D 639

KATZ V.U.S. 88 S ct 507. 389.US 347 19-Ed. 2d. 576

USCAConst. Amend 1 DANIAL VS, WATERS, 515 F. 2d 485 on remand 399 F. Supp 510.

C.A 1973 Fourteenth Amendment prohibits any state from taking action which would deny to any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the law. USCA Const. Amend.14
US Vs, Falk. 479 F 2d 616

D.C. Pa.1973. Promise of equal protection of the law not only means enactment of fair and impartial legislation, but also applicatation of such laws. U.S.C.A. Const. Amends. 5, 14,

U. S Vs. Yingling 68 F. Supp 379

Southland Mall Inc. Vs, Garner, 24 F supp 674 affirm 455 F. 2d 877

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Selp V. Councel of the City of Los Angles
90 F. Supp.58

C.A. Wis. 1975. United States, as well as each of the several states must grant each person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the law. USCA Const. Amend 5
Eska Vs. Morton, 524 F. 2d 9.

C.A. Ga. 1967. A lawyer is bound by the very highest ethical principales to exercise absolute faith toward and for his client.
Miller vs. Hansell 378 F. 2d 5'.
Legal Aid Attorneys D.C. code 1961, 2-2201, 2-22 02.
Young Vs. U.S. 46 F 2d 793 120 U.S. App D.C. 312

Among evils to be prevented by first Amendment press guarantees are not the censorship of the press merely, but any action by government by means of which it might prevent such free and general discussion of public matters as seems absolutely necessary to prepare the people for an intelligent exercise of their rights as citizens.
U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 1.
P.A.M. News Corp. Vs. Butz 514 F. 2d 272, 168 U.S. App. D.C. 376

Stanford VS. State of Texas 85 S. Ct. 506, 379

Bigilow Vs. Virginia, 95 S Ct. 2222.

OPINIONS

The Opinions of the Ninth Circut Court of Appeals is included in it's intirety as Appendex A 1 through A14.

JURISDICTION

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was rendered on August 29, 1985, and rehearing was denyed October 2, 1985.

This courts Jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1983 and all Civil Rights.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The First Amendment to the United States Constitution Provides:

> Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people to peacebaly to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution Provides:

> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses papers, and effects, against unreasonable search and seisures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and piticulary describing the place to be searched, and the persons or thangs to be seized.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The Fourteenth Amendment provides

> SECTION 1. All persons born, or naturalized in the United States, and subjected to the jurisdiction thereof, are Citizens of the United States and the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

STATMENT OF THE CASE

On June 1, 1984 Plaintiff filed a Civil Rights action against the State of California and respected employees. The Magistrate threw the case out Plaintiff alledges illegaly and without giving Plaintiff the right to amend. When in fact the complaint was perfectely legal and did not need amending. Federal Rule 1824, clearly states that before a court may dismiss on it's own motion for failure to state clame court must permit issueance of service of process must notify Plaintiff and give chance for argument and right to amend. Fed rules Civ. Proc. rule 4-A 28 USCA.

1742 A dismissal for failure to state clame requires judgement on merit and canno't be decided before court has assumed jurisdiction.

Plaintiff alledges this is a continueing cover up and deliberit denyal of her rights for political and other reasons.

Plaintiff further alledges that her rights on appeal were violated by purposely denying her the right to an oral argument. Plaintiff alledges because all facts and negligent behavior are true and this is a continueing conspirecy and cover up to keep the truth from coming out and their fear of what Plaintiff will say in a court of law.

The oral argument date was set and Plaintiff responded with her intent to be present with oral argument. She then received notice that the oral argument was canceled. She responded with her request for reinstatment of oral argument as her right and it was in-properly denyed.

Plaintiff is alledging a searious cover up of criminals and political reasons

for the denyal of her rights for fifteen years and other improper conduct of the courts and other state agencys to cover up for the wealthy people in this case and the political reasons of one group. And furthermore this is a conspirecy to cover up and keep this out of court because of fear of what Plaintiff will say.

Plaintiff disputes their findings in all cases as to the reasons for the dismissal. 1. The case is in no way frivilous and in no way illsuionsry. Plaintiff most definently spent six months in the county jail illegaly and without proper legal representation for political reasons and a cover up of the crimes against plaintiff and no equal protection of the law. She also was definently prevented from employment and had her hole life and all carees destroyed, and all of her

writings stolen used for political reasons and denyed publication, was also subjected to the interception of her mail and still is.

2. They most definently do have jurisdiction and the complaint most definently did state a clame.

3. Plaintiff was also definently given permission by the State Agency in Sacramento CAlifornia to sue. The lady in charge telling Plaintiff that they had canceled the hearing for her to come to Sacramento Ca. because the case was so terrible and illegal and posed to many questions of law to be necessary for a hearing and for her to go ahead and file the law suite. California according to Plaintiffs information definently waived it's eleventh amendment rights to immunity and no one can have immunity to such horrifing crimes, civil and human rights violations as were commited against Plaintiff.

STATMENTS OF THE CASE

Statments of the case and the violations that were incurred by Plaintiff. Plaintiff was employed for a period of nine months for Steve Crane Restaurants of Beverly Hills Ca. She worked with Cheryl Crane daughter of Actress Lana Turner. In short there was a revenge plot in progress over a murder they alledgedly commited some years before. Created because of the negligent press and it's continious coverage and negligent law playing the price is right not justice and making soap Opreas instead of truth and justice. All of which is the fault of them.

Because Plaintiff had helped Cheryl with her problems of that ordeal she was chosen to be the set up and because of the sexual orientation of Cheryl not Plaintiff and they had dug up a past

political, religious arrest and mess of Plaintiffs Father from 1951 when Plaintiff was ten years old and attempted to use that against Plaintiff for this Plaintiff alledges notorious crime having their as usual political, religious or Nazie story.

Plaintiff was afraid to go to the police in the beginning of this ordeal because of not knowing the idenities of all the people and knowing the Beverly Hills Chief of police was friends with some of the people and Cheryl Crane had been set up and arrested later admitted to Plaintiff as a set up. And She was under orders not to talk to Plaintiff causing Plaintiff to suffer irreversable damage and having to play games to identify the people herself. Plaintiff was bright enough to know that in these crimes they always have the same ingredents a

mentally retarded bus boy in this case they chose the rong bus girl, a book, a movie, the law and press. Plaintiff first wrote a screen play stolen and turned into a 1970 Academy Award movie. After more harassments and knowing this plot and no place to go for help she in desperation of being able to find the true ones and coming out alive or the victoms of this plot not being killed and blaming it on her, she then wrote a small book done in a few weeks. The book was used for Lana Turners life story. Plaintiff was then visited by two F.B.I. officers with letters she wrote Cheryl Crane because she could not talk and Plaintiff remembered the published letters in the case and had to play games. The visit was not official F.B.I. business according to federal guide lines. When Plaintiff attempted to varify the visit she was told they had no record of the visit, her or the case. Plaintiff was then referred to the law office of

William Jerome Pollack where she was met with the rest of this plot. Mr. Pollack knew her hole life story and made reference to her friends, then stated how can you possibley write a book so fast and a screen play without any training everything is so easy for you. He then stated he would take care of her career and everything. He then called and agent producer out of and ajoining room and introduced him to plaintiff, plaintiff alledges to get a good look at her so they could find someone to play her in this movie after she was set up for this notorious crime. This is sick but true so help me God. Plaintiff did not yet know who Mr. Pollack represented, 3 months later she was served with a court paper full of purjury and lies stating that she had went to Ms. Cranes house with two men threatening her life, ripped off a thousand pound door Plaintiff at 110 lb. absured, it also made statments aboui plaintiffs

intelligence. The F.B.I. at all times to the present denying any knowledge of Plaintiff, letter inclosed. Only one statment can be true, and they were either delibertely lieing and part of the plot or so gravely negligent as to pose a great danger to many lives. Plaintiff turned the paper over to Mr. Pollack and the night before court she was called to the office by Jerry Richman a paralegal in the firm. He then informed Plaintiff after three and one half months that they represented the family of the man killed by Cheryl Crane and that represented a grave conflict of intrest. He then like a mad man proceded to threaten Plaintiff, Cheryl and Lana Turners life. Plaintiff was delibertely without legal councel in a set up she alledges was for a murder. October 1973 case No. C 69222 Los Angeles Superior Court. The case was fixed and

over at two minutes after 9 AM without Plaintiffs presence or representation. Plaintiff went to the public defenders office and he said so why do you care what those people thank and politics. The law is not thanking it is supposed to be guilt or innocence and this was a purjury paper and set up for a crime and also threatening tapes were made. She was forced because of that group to file her own cross complaint. She then employed a Myron Roschko he filed no add-issue memorandum or anything he at all times lied to plaintiff kept her money and later admitted a conspirecy of using her and her book for political reasons. He demanded what Plaintiffs dead Father said asked her why Nixon would not resign and all sorts of statments about Patty Hearst includiing they had a reporter to write Plaintiffs story but right now she was to hot, plaintiff alledges only if this

set up crime had worked. He made a trip to Plaintiffs home town and Israel. Plaintiff alledges the reason for the trip to Israel was the fact that the S.L.A in the Hearst case took it's name from a South Leabonon Israelian Army stationed in Leabonon and was in fact Israelian terriost working in the U.S. Raping and torturing innocent Americans. They had also made tapes threatening Cranes wife trying to make it sound like Plaintiff because she was in fact a Leabonease Princess from Leabonon.

The Beverly Hills police refused to check out any complaints of Plaintiffs even when she was drugged and the lab technician could not identify what with. Plaintiff was forced to be her own Attorney and the State Bar refused to do anything to either Attorney though they had violated every code of ethics threatend lives and falsified records

kept Plaintiffs money. Plaintiff was denyed a trial for damages. The trial concerning the cross complaint was fixed in their favor the judge admitting the truth and retired. Plaintiff was told he was paid off. They plotted someone in Cheryls house dyed her hair black for a court apperance where the book Plaintiff was the subject she purposely describing her with black hair to trip up the one in this plot. Nothing was legal Plaintiff at all times without legal assistance because of a conspirecy. The Beverly Hills police would do nothing and Plaintiff was riding around and had employed without her knowledge the girl friend of the man killed by Cheryl without her knowledge and part of this conspirecy. That department covering for Lana. And arresting Plaintiff the victim harassing her for politics and a illegaly obtained book instead of crime and criminals, and were fully aware of

the truth protecting the wealthy and instead arresting Plaintiff the victim. The arresting officer waiting two hours for her to get off work stating, " What in the hell is this picking on a little thang like you if you have enough money you can do anything." A Beverly Hills police officer calling Plaintiff at 1 AM stating he had read her book and it was so political threatening her with arrest. The book being illegaly obtained by them. The bails bonds lady drove Plaintiff home and referred her to and Attorney Mr. Bitzcower she turned up married to a police officer and Mr. Bitzcower first pleaded innocent then in front of the judge insisted plaintiff plead no-contest then admitted he knew the one who had Plaintiff arrested and Pollack and they had to keep Plaintiff quiet.

plaintiff was sent to the same probation officer that handled Cheryl Crane her report a fake and disappering and other false reports made known to Judge Wiss. No wittnesses were called and Plaintiff was at no time properly represented. She was sentenced to jail by Jacquolin Wiss without a probation report and refusing to give Plaintiff one day to arrange for the care of a minor child indangering the life and safety of a minor child and causing grave suffering to a child this being a misdeminor and plaintiff no previous record of any kind.

The Appeal was not filed until almost plaintiffs release she having to take care of it herself court agreeing she had good cause. Another Attorney was appointed and she did not properly represent plaintiff and failed to notify Plaintiff of the hearing date or results until more then 90 days later delibertely making it to late to take to a higher court.

A man at the appeals court knowing of all illegal aspects told Plaintiff to take it to a Federal prosecutor. She wrote the judge he did not answer.

The F.B.I. again visited Plaintiffs home her sofa was later set on fire she again tryed to varify the visit was again lied to stating they did not have any black officers. One later identified by a Los Angles police officer as a narcotics agent for the feds. Plaintiff never having taken or had anything to do with drugs. They have at all times to the present denyed ay knowledge of Plaintiff and refused to take a civil rights complaint from plaintiff though her every Civil Right has been violated. And to this day Plaintiff canno't write anything without it being illegaly obtained by illegal entry into her premises through the mail or people plotted in other offices to illegaly obtain it.

It is criminal when the law is far more dishonest and distrustable then out and out criminals but in this case it is fact, and Plaintiffs friends had to protect her not them. It is time for the Supreme Court and all else to take searious action when the law is used as a political tool for any political grcup for persecutien of innocent citizens or setting up innocent people and politicians and famous people for crimes and politics indanger lives and American Citizens are more afraid of them then criminals and their honest is in twice as much question by citizens and people like Plaintiff who never broke any laws and she was imprisoned trying to save lives not the ones trying to destroy them. Plaintiff has continiousley for a period of fifteen years been harassed prevented from employment, sexually harassed by some of this group. Had her life and health destroyed used as a human experiment on stolen writings. Black listed from the

movie industry and from publishing her writings while this group makes hundreds of millions on them. She has had her premises illegaly entered and films and other thangs destroyed harassed in college and prevented from and education by this group. The POlice would at all times do nothing but tell her to do it herself, move to another country to get away from them. Even when they made threatening tapes involving lives which the police are obligated to check out they would not only gave Plaintiff a name of someone to inspect them for four hundred dollars. If Plaintiff were not very intelligent this crime would of worked thanks to the law. Plaintiff at this very times has another book stolen and turned into millions by them. Plaintiff was also subjected to someone belonging to the same church in every Legal Aid office, Federally Funded Civil rights Agency, the ACLU, Public

Defenders offices, and the Bar Association each covering for the other one no matter how vicious the crime. In this law suite they have tryed to turn it into a predjust issue instead of a criminal one. Plaintiff is well know to never having been predjust toward any people and did not know what a jewish person was and they informed her not her them and they used predjust against Plaintiff and violated her Civil Rights destroyed her life and career, worked in a conspirecy to obstruct justice, and used something her dead Father supposedly did when she was ten to destroy her career and set her up for a notorious crime.Using her and her brain for everything and attempting to insult her intelligence to cover up. Plaintiff is well known to be very, very intelligent on the Deans list, highest grade in Constitutional law writes book and is with proof completely sane.

REASON WHY THE WRIT SHOULD BE GRANTED

Cerritorari should be granted because of every American Citizens right to sue in a court of law to protect their rights and lives. Because of the clear provisions of Federal Rule 1824, and in this case the illegal denyal of right to amend and oral argument as well as no case can be dismissed befor issueance of service. This should be done to protect the rights and lives of All American Citizens our political leaders and famous people set up for politics and publicity and the very danger of any political or religious group using the law for political set ups and crimes, creating crime not preventing it. These kind of horrifing Attorneys canno't be allowed to get away with their crimes and frauds for the protection of all citizens. No citizen should have to represent themselves in such horror.

Plaintiff in this case lost fifteen years of her life, her health and all careers and canno't start them again at her age and was brilliant and talented in many areas including writing, acting, sanging and also could of gradueated from law school and been a practicing Attorney if not for this horror and even denyed the right to make a decent living all these years, she should be able to collect damage from the vicious and deliberit harm and loss of life inflicted on her by grave and purposely inflicted damage, and negligence.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Julie Kienast/
Plaintiff

V.

State of California, et al.
Defendants.

Judgment

Case No. Cv84-4093-CHH(P

Entered July 9, 1984

(File stamp deleted

Pursuant to the order of the court adopting the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the United States Magistrate,

It is ADJUDGED that the complaint and action are dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Dated: July 9, 1984

Cynthia Holcomb Hall

United States District Judge

(Signature deleted)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Julie Kienast

VS. Plaintiff-Appellant/

State of California employees Doe 1 thru 10/ California Bar Association / Beverly Hills POLice Department/ California FBI office/ Judge Weiss/ Judge Zuckor/ Seargent Ronnie Garner/ Edgar J. Bardin/ and Katheleen Collins/

Defendants-Appellees.

MEMORANDOM OPINION

Case No. 84-6243

DC No. CV 84-4093-CHH

Decided August 29,1985

(file stamp deleted)

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Central District of California Cynthia Holcom Hall/ District Judge/ Presiding

Submitted August 5, 1985--Pasadena California.

Before: Skopil and Canby/ Circuit Judge and Solomon/ District Judge

Julie Kienast appeals the dismissal with prejudice of her section 1983 Civil Rights Action. She filed against various employees and entities of the State of California.

This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by ninth circuit rule 21.

The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for submission on the record and briefs and without oral argument. Fed. R. P. 34 (a/ Ninth Circuit Rule 3 (f.

The Honorable Gus J. Solomon/ Senior United States District Judge for the District of Oregon/ sitting by designation.

1.-MEMORANDOM

For federal courts to have subject matter Jurisdiction in a section 1983 clame/ the complaint must fulfill two criteria:
1. it must state a colorable clame for relief under section 1983: (2 the clame must not be wholly insubstantial and frivolous. Mifofsky V. Superior Court of California/ 7o3 F. 2d 332/335 N4

(9th Cir. 198)(citing Jackson Transit Authority V. Local Division 1285/ Amalgamated Transit Union/ 457 U.S. 15, 21 (1982)(quoting Bell/ 327 U.S. at 682-83) A clame may be wholly insubstantial when it is obviousley without merit/ or is unsound due to previous decisions which leave no room for controversy. Hagan V. Levine/ 415 U.S. 528/ 536-38 (1974.

The District Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. Kienast fails to identify the Civil Rights alledgely violated. She alleges mere conclusions which are insufficent to state clame. Kennedy V. H&M Landing/ Inc./ 529 F. 2d 987/ (9th Cir. 1976. Her unintelligible complaint lacks merit merit. She fails to recite the elements of any clame that would entitle her to any type of relief in the Federal Court.

Even assuming this court could find a valid section 1983 clame in Kienast's complaint, the eleventh amendment bars suite against a state and it s agencys for the alledged deprivation of Civil Rights absent state consent to be sued in Federal court, Quern V. Jordan/ 440 U.S. 332/ 340-45 (1979. California has not waived its eleventh amendment immunity.

See Riggle V. State of California/ 577 F.2d 579/ 581-82 (9th Cir. State bar association is immune under eleventh amendment/ cert- denied/ 459 U.S. 1071 (1982. Additionely/ those involved in the judicial process enjoy certain immunities. See/ e.g. Stump V. Sparkman/ 435 U.S. 349/ 356-57 (1978 Judges immune for action taken over which they had jurisdiction; Szijarto V. Legeman/ 466 F. 2d 864 (9th Cir. 1972. (per curim, retained and appointed councel may not be sued under 42 U.S.C. 1983because they do not act under color of state law. It was proper to dismiss the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

2. Dismissed with prejudice.

We review a dismissel without leave to amend under an abuse of discretion standard. Keinston V. Roberts/ 717 F.2d at 1300.

On a motion to dismiss, courts should construe complaints filed by pro se Plaintiffs such as Kienast liberally/ Haines V. Kerner/ 404 U.S. 519/ 520 1972. Gillespie V. Civiletti/ 629 F. 2d 637/ 640(9th Cir. 1980/ avoiding dismissal unless it is clear that the deficencies of the

complaint could not be cured by Amendment. Broughton V. Cutter Laboratories/ 622 F. 2d 458/460 (9th Cir. 1980. While denying leave is within the discretion of the trial court/ ordinarely/ leave to amend should be freely given in the absence of prejudice to the opposing party. Waits V. Weller/ 653 F. 2d 1288. 1288/ 1290 (9th Cir.1981. However, leave to amend may be denied due to the futility of amend. Form V. Davis 371 U.S. 178/ 182 1962.

The magistrate found that it would be futile to afford Kienast the opportunity to amend due to patently illusionary allegations. Kienast answer to the magistrates recommendation as well as her appellant brief/ do not indicate an ability to meaningfully amend the complaint. Indeed, they reassert the same statments. The district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing Kienas't complaint with prejudice.

The judgment is Affirmed.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

HEARING CALENDER

Place of Hearing	Date of notice
Pasadena City Hall 100 North Garfield, Room 247 Pasadena, California	Jul 3 1985
Monday August 5, 1985	9:00 a.m.

67 Julie Kienast V. State of Calif. employees/ et al.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Julie Kienast
Plaintiff/Appellant,
Vs.
State of Californai
Doe 1 thru 10,
Californai Bar
Association, Beverly Hills
Police Department,
California FBI Office,
Judge Weiss, Judge
Zuckor, Seargent Ronnie
Gardner, Edgar R. Bardin
Katheleen Collins,
Defendants/Appellees.

File stamp signature deleted.

Filed July 19,1985
Case NO. 84-6243
D.C. No. cr 84-4093-CHH

Order

No oral argument will be herd in this case. It will stand submitted as of August 5, 1985.

For the court;
Phillip B. Winberger
Clerk of the court
by; Rodger T. Writter

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Julie Kienast

Appellant,

V.

State of California
employees doe 1 thru 10
California FBI Office,
Judge Weiss, Judge Zuckor
Seargent Ronnie Gardner,
Edgar R. Bardin, Kathleen
Collins,

Appellees.

Filed October 2, 1985
received October 5,1985

Case No. 84-- 6243
DC No. CV 84-4093-CHH

File stamp deleted
no signature appeared
on the order

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Central District of California Cynthia Holcomb Hall, District Judge, Presiding

Before: Skopil and Canby, Circuit Judge, and Solomon, District Judge*

The panel has voted to deny the petition for rehearing. The petition for rehearing is denyed.

The Honorable Gus J. Solomon, Senior United States District Judge for the District of Oregon, setting by designation.

No signature appeared on the order.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JULIE KIENAST
plaintiff

VS.

State of California ET al

Defendants

Affadavit of Conflict of intrest and

Bias and prejudice.

Case No. CV84-409 CHH (P

Plaintiff alledges that the Honorable Cynthia Helcomb Hall being from a law firm practicing in Beverly Hills and a frien or associate of all the guilty partys in this complaint represents a definent conflict of intrest, as dose her being a former Justice Department Attorney which is a party to this action, as well as her appointment by Richard Nixon this case arising from politics and religion.

As well as as soon as this case was dismissed in the Los Angles Federal court she was convienently transfered or promoted to set on the San Francisco Court of Appeals. Plaintiff alledging no accident but rather another illegal act of the courts to cover up this criminal actions and injustices inflicted on Plaintiff by the Courts and Attorneys for their political reasons for fifteen years.

Julie Kienast

Julie Kienast.

FRESNO CITY COLLEGE

1101 East University Ave.
Fresno , California 93741
Telephone (209) 442-4600

June 25,1982

Julie June Kienast
820 Alhambra St. #E
Fresno, Ca

Dear Ms. Kienast,

On behalf of the Fresno City College Administration and faculty, it is my pleasure to commend you for your outstanding scholastic record at Fresno City College for the Spring 1982 semester and for your placement on the Dean's list with a 3.0 or better grade point average.

Please accept my congraduelations and best wishes for your continued success.

Sincerely

Roberet E. Fox Dean of student services
(Signature and seal deleted)

Certificate of service by mail

I hereby certify that 1 copy of the afore said brief for petitioner was mailed this day to:

EDGAR R. BARDIN , 21241 Ventura Blvd.
WOODLAND HILLS, CA

Kathleen M. Collins Suite 20o 1455 Crenschaw Blvd.
Torrance, Ca. 90501

California F.B.I. Office, 11000 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angles, Ca 90024

State Bar of California, 555 Franklin St.
San Francisco, Ca 94102

Beverly HIlls Police Dept. 450 N. Crecent Dr.
Beverly Hills, Ca 90210

Judge Jackolin Wiss
Superior Court
1725 Main St.
Santa Monica, Ca 90401